SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

11th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XI, No. 12 P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015 July 15, 1981

Anti-Kook Rules Set for Filling Top NIH Job

With numerous key government posts consigned to the wrecker wing of the Reaganite camp, fears have naturally arisen that a pre-Darwinian troglodyte might be appointed to fill the suddenly vacated directorship of the National Institutes of Health.

But though Donald S. Fredrickson stepped out of the job with a minimum of lame-duckery—announced June 19th and gone July 1—it appears that he wielded some beneficial influence on the criteria for selecting his successor. As announced on the day of Fredrickson's departure by Health and Human Services Secretary Richard S. Schweiker—who had cordially invited Fredrickson to stay on at the outset of the Reagan Administration—the ground rules for picking a new NIH chief virtually eliminate the out-of-the-cave types who now fill many of Washington's excecutive suites.

Schweiker, with whom Fredrickson privately met three days before telling the NIH staff of his plans, set a four-part standard for filling the post:

- A record of excellence in research.
- Leadership in the biomedical community.
- Proven ability to administer a complex organization.
- Talent for choosing and inspiring capable colleagues.

What is significant about these criteria is that, first of all, they rule out what, in other administrations, would be unthinkable—a non-scientist at the helm of NIH. They also rule out what's within the realm of reasonable choice—a mere physician. What it finally comes down to, assuming that Schweiker and, ultimately, the President, decided to abide by the criteria, is that the next NIH director is very likely to have a curriculum vitae like most, if not all, past NIH directors.

To apply the criteria, Schweiker appointed a three-member search committee that's notable for its biomedical establishment character and absence of political coloration:

Edward Brandt Jr. (chairman), Assistant Secretary for Health, formerly Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs, University of Texas.

Robert J. Rubin, Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, formerly Chief of the Renal Division at Boston's Lemuel Shattuck Hospital: Assistant Dean for Government Affairs, Tufts Medical School, and a Schweiker staff associate in the Senate.

Arthur Hull Hayes Jr., Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, formerly Professor of Medicine and Pharmacology, Pennsylvania State College of Medicine.

If there had been a desire to provide some right-wing balance to the search committee, a natural would have been the under-occupied C. Everett Koop, the Flying Dutchman of Health and Human Services, currently in storage with the title of Deputy Assistant Secretary of Health while his nomination as Surgeon General languishes on Capitol Hill. But it was plain that Schweiker, whose opinion will guide the White House

(Continued on Page 2

Reagan Science Aide Voices Old OMB Austerity Theme—Page 8

In Brief

Despite all the talk of reduced government spending, the Reagan R&D proposals add up to a big increase in budget authority in fiscal 1982—with the annual total rising from $35.5 billion to $40.7 billion. The catch is that defense gets the bulk of the growth, so much so that its share of the bundle rises from 47 per cent to 57 per cent of all federal R&D spending, according to NSF's newly issued "Federal R&D Funding by Budget Function—1980-82," available without charge from: NSF, Division of Science Resources Studies, Washington, D.C. 20550.

With few exceptions, however, the Reagan "cuts" work out to reductions in the increases that Carter proposed for the coming fiscal year. For example, in health-related research, Carter sought an 8-per-cent increase; Reagan shaved it to 6 per cent.

Philip Handler's retirement July 1 after 12 years as President of the National Academy of Sciences was the occasion for a series of affectionate goodbye parties with friends and colleagues, but to the consternation of some, drew no laudatory farewell editorial from any newspaper—including the science-minded NY *Times*. An attempt to interest that journal in giving Handler one of its job-well-done pats produced no results.

Handler is off to science's summer watering place, Woods Hole, Mass., where his successor, Frank Press, is also spending some time while settling into the presidency on a part-time basis. Unfavorable reaction to Press's abrupt firing of a veteran NAS staffer, Murray Todd, is said to have inspired caution about future moves.

...Post May be Filled Before Labor Day

(Continued from Page 1)

on the directorship appointment, was in harmony with Fredrickson concerning the importance of protecting the position from disruptive influences.

The Brandt committee will be accepting suggestions until July 17. It's expected to report to Schweiker shortly after that, and all around it's expected that the post will be filled fairly soon, perhaps before Labor Day.

One reason for moving quickly is that NIH has been carrying on with several high-level vacancies in recent months, and it's not likely that suitable candidates would want to sign on before a new Director is selected for the overall operation.

Why did Fredrickson decide to leave, especially when his first stop is nothing more alluring than a one-year appointment as a Distinguished Visiting Scholar at the National Academy of Sciences? In that role, he'll be working on a subject that he regards as mightily important, the organizational and financial future of basic research. But, clearly, that wasn't enough to lure him away from the directorship of the world's leading biomedical research institution, especially when things were going reasonably well in rather difficult times.

Coming during a period of general budgetary turbulence, the resignation understandably aroused suspicions of discontent with the Reagan Administration. NIH, however, has been only lightly nicked by the budget pruners, and Schweiker has gone to some lengths to express and demonstrate support for Fredrickson's performance.

In these circumstances, it seems fair to accept at face value Fredrickson's explanation—presented to the staff in the Clinical Center auditorium on June 19— which simply adds up to his feeling that he's had enough of long service in a burdensome administrative job; six years as Director, through the comings and goings of three presidencies. NIH, he said, "seems as exhilirating and worthwhile as in the summer of 1953, when I arrived. The last six years, however, have been spent in the relentless company of the administrative burdens of Director."

He went on to say, "It is time to shed them for a while, lest I forget completely how to be a scientist and a physician."

Maybe the lab bench or bedside is the next stop beyond the one-year Academy appointment. (Fredrickson is known for keeping scientifically abreast of his speciality, coronary research, and is still co-editor of a periodically updated standard work, *The Metabolic Basis of Inherited Disease*.) But for the time being, he sounds like a man who wants to decompress from a long, arduous experience. If he wants to go on to an academic administrative post, the year at the Academy will provide some of the cooling-off that's prescribed by the federal government's tough ethics rules.

In any case, in a capital where backbiting is the norm, Fredrickson had few, if any, detractors, credible or otherwise, in science or politics. He goes off with abundant good wishes and appreciation.—DSG

Sweet Adieus for NIH Chief

Aficionados of that telltale brand of Washington literature, the goodbye letter, will find no fuel for suspicions that Donald Fredrickson's departure from the directorship of the National Institutes of Health was inspired by friction between him and his political superiors.

In a letter to Health and Human Services Secretary Richard S. Schweiker, dated June 17, Fredrickson said, "I take this step with great ambivalence, for NIH is in the very marrow of my bones. I very much appreciated your immediate invitation to continue in my post upon your taking office as Secretary, and have enjoyed the continuation during the past six months of our shared interests in maintaining the vitality of biomedical research....Our personal relationship has been an easy one of mutual interest and respect..."

Schweiker's response, dated the 18th, said "First as a Senator keenly concerned about biomedical research, and now as Secretary of HHS, I have deeply valued our close working association....Recently, we have talked about the golden age of opportunity now before us in biomedical research and the need to husband our resources to take the best possible advantage of these opportunities. Your leadership has ushered us into this exciting new era. I know you share my enthusiasm for the challenges we face...."

A statement by Assistant Secretary for Health Edward Brandt Jr. said of Fredrickson: "I will...miss him as part of the Public Health Service and will treasure our friendship."

NSF Awards Computer Grants

The National Science Foundation has announced big grants for experimental computer science research and facilities at three universities.

Spread over five years, the awards are to the University of Wisconsin, Madison, a total of $4.6 million for developing a system of 50 interconnected computers. The University of Illinois, Urbana, $4 million to expand research on computer aids to program and systems development. And Cornell, $2.6 million to study the use of automation in programming.

There's Still a National Science Foundation

Soon after the House passed Gramm-Latta II—the Reagan-backed package of $38.2 billion in 1982 budget cuts—calls of commiseration and offers of help poured into the National Science Foundation from university researchers around the country. They had heard that the NSF was inadvertently wiped out in the confused wheeling and dealing that preceded Reagan's triumph over the House's (now-nominal) Democratic leadership.

The callers were stirred up by weekend press reports that the Republicans had obliterated the NSF and the research programs of several other agencies—Environmental Protection Agency, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Federal Emergency Management Agency, and Federal Aviation Administration—with a hand-scribbled note deleting them from the budget Reconciliation Bill that the House passed 217-211 on June 26. (The Department of Energy's R&D activities were eliminated too, but, unlike the others, they were reinstated—along with the Clinch River Breeder Reactor, which the House Science and Technology Committee had voted not to fund.)

NSF Congressional liaison Patricia Nicely was able to assure anxious callers that there was no danger of the Foundation going out of business. But, having been left out of the Gramm-Latta package, NSF will have to fend for itself on the House floor, with its own separate authorization bill.

This is the way it has always been done in the past. The difference this year is that OMB Director David Stockman seized control of Congress's budget "reconciliation" machinery to bundle together scores of traditionally separate authorizations into a single fat target for his axe. In this circumstance, it remains to be seen whether NSF will, in the end, fare better or worse in splendid isolation than it would have done wrapped up in the reconciliation blanket. The pessimists feel that, naked, the Foundation will be an even more tempting target for the Reaganite predators.

Others point out that the Republicans would not have left NSF unmolested if they had decided to count it in. As part of the reconciliation bill, the Foundation would probably have been given a 1982 spending ceiling of $1.033 billion—the same overall figure as Reagan's revised 1982 budget, though not divided up in quite the same way. That is $127 million less than the level recommended by the House Science and Technology Committee, whose proposal was included by the House Budget Committee in the ill-fated counter-budget offered by the Democratic leadership. (The original 1982 budget—a fantasy put forward by the Carter Administration shortly before it left office—requested $1.353 billion.)

The optimists feel that, even in the present political climate, they should be able to persuade the House to pass a separate NSF authorization bill that would cut science education and social science research less brutally than the Administration wants. If they can hold on to the formula agreed by the Science and Technology Committee, science education could receive $75 million in 1982, compared to the $9.9 million in phase-out funds requested by Reagan, and $26.1 million could be restored to the social and behavioral sciences.

Of course, the House is only part of the equation. The Senate reconciliation bill did include NSF, at the $1.044 billion level recommended by the Labor and Human Resources Committee. The Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation had proposed a slight increase—$1.047.5. Sen. Harrison Schmitt (R-NM), Chairman of its Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee, argued that his panel should take over some of the responsibility for NSF that has traditionally rested with the Committee on Labor and Human Resources. But the jurisdictional dispute ended with a defeat for Schmitt's empire-building ploy.

One possibility is that the forthcoming House-Senate conference to resolve differences between the two reconciliation bills may produce a compromise that includes NSF—presumably at about the $1.045 billion level—even though it is not part of the House package.

At the moment, however, it seems that almost anything could happen to the 1982 NSF budget. "The position is completely indeterminate," said NSF Deputy Director Donald Langenberg, who, along with many others in Washington these days, stressed the difficulty of finding what's already happened—let alone foreseeing what's to come.—CC

©Science & Government Report, Inc., 1981

ISSN 0048-9581

Editor and Publisher
Daniel S. Greenberg

Associate Publisher
Wanda J. Reif

Circulation Manager
Gail A. Gallessich

Contributing Correspondents
David Dickson, Clive Cookson (Washington); Francois Seguier (Paris)

Independently published by *Science & Government Report*, Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, July and August. Annual Subscription: Institutions, $118.50 (two years, $198.50); individuals, $48.50 (two years, $82.50). Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St., N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second class postage paid at Washington, DC. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on Xerox University Microfilms. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six months of publication date.

Student Aid Walloped in Budget Cutbacks

The Middle Income Student Assistance Act (MISA) of 1978 and last year's Higher Education Act marked the twin pinacles of the college and university associations' influence in Washington. But it has taken only a few months for the Reaganite budget steamroller to demolish MISA completely and half-flatten the more substantial Higher Education Act, which reauthorized the Education Department's college and university programs for the next five years.

Education lobbyists, who had been expecting to blunt the impact of Reagan's budget-cutting by exerting pressure in the traditional way during the complex Congressional budget process, have been left virtually impotent by the Administration's brilliant use of the "reconciliation" procedure.

The process, whose sweet-sounding name belies its ruthless nature, removes the power that used to be wielded by the authorizing committees, which set spending ceilings and erect the legislative framework for programs, and the appropriations committees, which decide how much will actually be spent each year. They have to "reconcile" their programs with an omnibus package of budget cuts decided in advance by Congress. Reconciliation does not merely force cuts in expenditure; the Republicans are using it to rewrite the basic legislation underlying federal programs.

In education, the most radical legislative changes affect elementary and secondary schools. Twenty-five separate programs, including grants for adult education, teacher centers, and science teacher training, have been lumped together into a single block grant of about $600 million a year. That will be distributed to the states with few strings attached. The higher-education portion of the budget reconciliation bills passed separately by the Senate and the House in the last week of June agrees quite closely with the proposals that the Reagan Administration put forward four months ago. But there are differences between them which will have to be ironed out in conference later this month.

There is no doubt, however, that a means test will be reimposed on guaranteed student loans, which have been available to anyone regardless of family wealth since 1978. Loans will be restricted to the amount that students need to cover educational costs, taking into account other financial aid and an income-related family contribution. In the Senate bill, students whose parents earn less than $25,000 a year will automatically be eligible for a loan; others will qualify only if they prove financial need. The House requires all students to take a means test whatever their family income. That is one of the differences that the two houses still have to sort out.

Rep. Paul Simon (D-Ill.), Chairman of the subcommittee responsible for higher education, told the House during the budget debate that the means test would deny loans to 1.3 million students. That estimate came from a coalition of college and university associations lobbying against the Republican bill. Additional savings will be made by imposing a new "origination fee" of four or five per cent of the value of a guaranteed loan (the exact figure has not been agreed yet) when students first take it out. However, none of the changes will be implemented until October 1, by which time students will have settled all their financial arrangements for the coming academic year. The changes will really hit home in 1982-83.

The interest rates on guaranteed loans have not been raised. They are still interest-free while the borrower is a full-time student; the rate is nine per cent following graduation. But the rate on "parent loans" jumps from nine to 14 per cent.

The reconciliation bill also sets a spending limit for the first time on basic student grants—this year renamed Pell grants—for the next three years. It allows no increase for inflation and provides a maximum grant of $1800 a year for the poorest students.

Payments from the Social Security system to students whose parents are dead, retired, or disabled will be phased out starting next June, in accordance with the wishes of the Reagan Administration. These benefits are not based on financial or educational need, the White House says; beneficiaries who really need the money will be eligible for regular grants and loans, like any other students.

Many other programs benefiting colleges and universities were cut by the reconciliation bill, including the National Endowments for the Arts and the Humanities. The House capped the combined budgets of the two endowments at $223 million a year until 1984; their appropriation for 1981 was $310 million. However, it did at least give NEH and NEA a chance to avoid the 50 per cent cut that the Administration had originally proposed.

New Head for Research Corp

John P. Schaefer, President of the University of Arizona since 1971, will leave that post next year to take the presidency of the Research Corporation, a long-established non-profit in the currently trendy field of stirring up patentable research in academic institutions. Schaefer, trained as a chemist, will succeed James S. Coles, who's retiring.

Biomedical Research Wins a Lobbying Round

Intense lobbying by the biomedical-research community brought its reward—if only temporarily—last month when the House rejected the Administration's efforts to remove all $52 million of institutional support funds from the National Research Service Awards (NRSA), administered by the Department of Health and Human Services.

The decision emerged from the closely fought vote on the Gramm-Latta budget reconciliation package, which rejected many of the alternative budget proposals put forward by House Democrats. But in the process, the House retained a recommendation put forward by John Dingell (D-Mich.), Chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, that salvaged funds for the NRSA grants.

About 10,000 awards are currently made each year under the NRSA scheme, which is designed primarily to assist those who wish to enter research careers. Officials at the Office of Management and Budget have long contended that the institutional support included in this scheme provides unnecessary federal backing for the nation's universities and medical schools. And in the budget proposals submitted to Congress in March, the new Administration announced its intention "to end the current practice of paying more to educational institutions for a federally-supported research trainee under the national research service awards program than is charged in tuition and fees to non-federally supported students at the same institutions." Thus, students would be aided, but the institutions would not receive direct assistance.

The research institutions themselves have been mounting a fierce counter-attack, spearheaded by groups such as the Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC). At the end of April, a memorandum was circulated to members of Congress outlining the importance of institutional support in the financing of biomedical research and training. The AAMC calculated that in fiscal year 1980, indirect cost reimbursements and other institutional allowances totalled $41.4 million out of a NIH research training budget of $141.7 million for institutional awards alone.

Among the various reasons for opposing the cuts proposed by the Administration, the AAMC stated that "funds provided through the institutional support components enable institutions to dedicate additional faculty time to the training effort, establish invaluable seminar series, and purchase essential equipment and supplies. Without such additional funds, the qualitative characteristics of the training environment would be markedly inferior to those made possible by them." Ronald W. Lamont-Havers, Director of Research Administration at Massachusetts General Hospital, and previously Deputy Director of the National Institutes of Health, warned that "the provision of trainee stipends is an important commitment on the part of the federal government in sustaining the nation's biomedical research effort. The training program is in danger of faltering, however, if support for the other essential elements of the program are eliminated."

Both the Senate and the House responded favorably to these arguments in taking action on the rescissions which the Reagan Administration had proposed for the fiscal year 1981. In both cases, money for institutional support which had been earmarked for elimination was restored to allow NIH to maintain the level of awards which it had previously been planning for. Lamon-Havers told a recent meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science that if the money had not been restored by Congress, "great hardship would have occurred because of the relatively short notice of such cuts."

Getting the money back into the 1982 budget is likely to prove more difficult. Already the issue has produced a stalemate in the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee, whose Chairman, Orrin Hatch (R-Utah), is defending the Administration's proposals. He's being strongly challenged by Senator Edward Kennedy (D-Mass) and other Committee members who are seeking to restore the $52 million in institutional support which Administration wants to eliminate.

In passing its own version of the budget reconciliation bill, the Senate placed a "cap" on spending by the National Institutes of Health of $3.7 billion—a move which itself is being challenged by the research community. However, no specific mention was made of the research training awards, leaving it in theory open to the Secretary of HHS to determine the manner in which the awards should be distributed.

The main attention has focused on the House. Shortly before the vote on the budget resolution, 58 separate medical associations, ranging from the American Association of Chairmen of Departments of Psychiatry to the Center for Ulcer Research and Education Foundation, sent a letter to Rep. Dingell voicing their support for his efforts to oppose the Administration's proposed cuts in support for research training.

Claiming that "the primary responsibility for the federal government for sponsorship of the nation's biomedical research enterprise is both well-established and unquestioned," they asserted that "an essential derivative of that responsibility involves the assurance

(Continued on Page 6)

...But Institutional Funds Not Yet Safe

(Continued from Page 5)

of an adequate research manpower pool, as measured in terms of quantity, quality and diversity." The medical associations added that the reduction being proposed by the Administration in the form of an amendment expected from Rep. James Broyhill (R-NC) "appears, whether intended to or not, to be severely harmful to critically important health programs that have been built slowly, with painstaking care and careful nurture, over the last three decades."

The concerns expressed by local institutions and medical groups seem to have been sufficient to persuade several Congressmen that they would only vote for the Gramm-Latta substitute package—as Mr. Reagan was angling for—if the cuts in indirect cost and other institutional allowances was not included. Somewhat to the surprise of NIH, the Broyhill amendment was not offered when the budget was debated on the floor of the House. And the bill as the House passed it currently includes the full $194 million which Mr. Dingell had proposed.

Whether the money will survive further negotiations remains an open question. Some observers feel that when a conference is held to reconcile the House and Senate versions of the Budget Reconciliation bill, the Senate will withdraw from its demand for a "cap" on spending by the NIH and the National Institute of Mental Health, which the medical associations in their letter of support to Mr. Dingell describe as "arbitrary, unprecedented and unnecessary." But the price could be acceptance at that stage of the Broyhill amendments, bringing the whole package back in line with the Administration's proposals.

Uncertainty also hangs over the prospects for the authorizing legislation currently being debated in the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee. Chairman Hatch has introduced a bill, S.800, "The Health Care Research and Research Training Amendments of 1981," which would legitimize the Administration's efforts to eliminate institutional support by giving the Secretary of HHS discretion to decide how best to allocate funds under a training grant "in an attempt to reduce indirect and unnecessary program costs." And the Administration has introduced its own bill expressing OMB's position, S.1285, which would go further and repeal the statutory basis on which the Secretary is entitled to provide institutional support through training grants (a situation which could lead to a legal challenge if NIH subsequently attempted to provide such support).

S.800, however, is currently stalled in a dispute between Senators Hatch and Kennedy on an overall authorization level for the NIH. Hatch is said to have promised that, if the lower authorization figure of $147 million is approved, he will personally intervene with the White House in an attempt to have it increased. So far this has not been good enough for the Democrats on the Committee (plus two renegade Republicans), who want to increase the authorization by $50 million over the Administration request.

Both OMB and the medical schools argue that there are important ideological issues at stake. "The important thing is to maintain the principle of institutional support; our concern has been the running battle with OMB," John Sherman, Vice-President for Research of the AAMC, said last week.

Lamont-Havers describes the cuts as "simplistic solutions applied for purely economic reasons," arguing that although it may be possible to substitute private for federal support in fashionable areas, such as molecular biology, "one has to be very careful that in supporting these areas the broad underpinning of support does not get weakened."

But the Administration seems so far committed to the view that institutional support for institutions that train research workers is a luxury rather than a necessity, a position which the AAMC, in an inimitable style, says "interdicts continuation of a form of support utilized since the assumption of major responsibility by the federal government for sponsorship of the nation's highly successful biomedical research program over three decades ago."—DD

In Print

Education Directory, Colleges and Universities 1980--81, provides basic information (tuition, calendar system, programs, etc.) on 3270 institutions of higher education; produced by the US National Center for Education Statistics, available for $10 per copy from: Superintendent of Documents, USGPO, Washington, DC 20402; specify S/N 065-000-00082-2.

New publications of the 24-nation Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development:

Educational Statistics in OECD Countries, 232 pages, $12, provides data on enrollments, expenditures, and other aspects of education.

The Utilization of the Social Sciences in Policy Making in the United States—Case Studies, 392 pages, $20, contains nine case studies on the use of social sciences at the federal level, plus commentary by social scientists on their activities with government.

These volumes are available from OECD Publications and Information Center, Suite 1207, Pennsylvania Ave. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006; tel. (202) 724-1857.

News Notes: Geology, Social Sciences, etc.

Dallas L. Peck, Chief Geologist and a career-long employee of the US Geological Survey, is the President's choice for the top post of the Survey. Peck, 52, succeeds H. William Menard, whose pro forma resignation was unexpectedly accepted when the new Administration took over. The appointment was recommended by the National Academy of Sciences, which, as is the custom, drew up a list of candidates at the request of the Secretary of the Interior Department, parent agency of the Survey. Menard's departure had no direct political content, apart from the sweep-'em-out mood of the incoming leadership; Peck's appointment appears to be similarly apolitical.

●

The Board of Directors of the American Psychological Association has resolved that the Reagan Administration is "inappropriately influencing the scientific process" by selectively cutting up the budget of the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration (ADAMHA). In a resolution adopted June 20, the APA Board protested ADAMHA's plans to drop support for social research that's not directly linked to the agency's health concerns.

The APA board argued that there's no evidence that the social research is less effective than basic biological research, adding that "scientific evidence suggests that many mental health problems are best understood and dealt with by looking at the joint impact of biological, behavioral and social processes."

●

Meanwhile, the APA has revised its *Ethical Principles for Psychologists,* with major changes in its guidelines concerning confidentiality, counseling through the news media, and increased emphasis against sexual harrassment of clients, students, and others.

The revisions, the sixth since the APA first issued *Ethical Principles* in 1952, permit a psychologist to make a breach of confidentiality without a client's prior consent in "unusual circumstances in which not to do so would result in clear danger to the person or to others."

The guidelines also take account of the popularity of radio and press counseling by psychologists by specifying that psychologists in such cases should exercise "the highest level of professional judgment."

Single copies of *Ethical Principles of Psychologists* are available without charge from: Order Department, American Psychological Association, 1200 17th St. NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.

●

The National Science Foundation has awarded the City College of the City University of New York $2.7 million to set up a Resource Center for Science and Engineering that's intended to encourage minority and disadvantaged students in pursuing careers in science and engineering.

Running against the current political tide, that goal has been given a high priority by NSF Director John B. Slaughter, the first black to head the Foundation.

In a statement accompanying announcement of the award, Slaughter said, "Our most pressing need is to ensure that our science and technology enterprise is driven by the best and most highly trained individuals our society can produce."

The New York Center is the fourth to be funded by NSF since the program was established in 1978. Its Director will be Robert M. Lea, Professor of Physics at City College. Several nearby institutions will also be involved, including the Stevens Institute of New Jersey and the New York Academy of Science.

●

The crackpot scheme to generate solar power from big mirrors in space has been ridiculed to near-extinction by a newly issued report of the National Academy of Sciences. After studying the notion, the NAS Committee on Satellite Power Systems concluded that "The concept of an SPS is presently faced with sufficiently serious difficulties—in technological readiness, cost, competing technologies for generating electricity, magnitude of the enterprise, and international concerns—that no funds should be committed during the next decade to pursue development of an SPS."

Subscription Form

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

☐ Renew my subscription; ☐ Check enclosed

☐ Enter my subscription; ☐ Please bill

Institutional subscribers: one year, $118.50 ☐; two years, $198.50 ☐

Individual subscribers: (To home address, payment by personal check)
one year, $48.50 ☐; two years, $82.50 ☐

(Overseas airmail, $25.00 per year additional.)

Name _____

Address _____

_____ Zip _____

Keyworth Says US Can't be Tops in all R&D

The first public address by George A. Keyworth II since he was nominated May 19 to be presidential science adviser was mainly run-of-the-mill stuff about the importance of basic research, academic-industrial research ties, and so forth.

But there was one passage of a different sort, and it's especially noteworthy because it reflects a theme that Office of Management Budget science honcho Hugh F. Loweth and others had unsuccessfully sought to peddle to Keyworth's two immediate predecessors, Guy Stever, of the Ford Administration, and Frank Press, who worked for Carter.

The theme (see box) is that the US cannot afford to be tops across the board in all fields of science.

For years, OMB has been pushing that notion, with soft suggestions that its enunciation by the President's science adviser would be beneficial for the cooling effect that it would have on the fiscal expectations of the R&D enterprise. Stever and Press ignored the hints.

Keyworth's speech, delivered in Washington June 25 at the annual R&D Colloquium of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, was jointly written by him and two members of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, Denis Prager and Stanley D. Schneider. Both are among the 12 professionals that remained with OSTP after last January's change of administration.

As has been the custom in past administrations, a draft of the speech was sent to OMB, where, according to SGR's source, it was checked over by Kshitij Mohan, a budget examiner on the staff of Loweth, Deputy Associate Director for Energy and Science. No changes were suggested.

As of this writing, Keyworth still bears the title of OSTP Director-designate, since his confirmation hearing has been delayed by a crowded Senate calendar and the July 4th recess, and is still to be scheduled. But it's sure to be a congenial affair, as it will be before the Committee on Commerce, Transportation, and Science, on which his home state Senator, Harrison Schmitt (R-NM), presides over science.

Constraints and Choices

The following passage is from a speech, "Science and Technology Policy—What's Ahead?" delivered June 25 by George A. Keyworth II, President Reagan's nominee for White House science adviser:

●

It is no longer within our economic capability, nor perhaps even desirable, to aspire to primacy across the spectrum of scientific disciplines. The constraints of reality require discrimination and vision, attainable only through a collaboration of the Government and the scientific and engineering communities. We must strive to identify those disciplinary areas where vitality is required to support industrial, military and other essential technologies, as well as those with particular scientific promise, the latter measured in terms of probability of major breakthroughs.

As Government support has proceeded to dominate basic research in the latter half of this century, we must ask ourselves if we have apportioned resources wisely. My own perception is that, whereas the present distribution of resources is reasonable, the future will require difficult choices and reapportionment. I believe the criteria upon which these choices must be based must be both clear and simple: the principal criterion for the pursuit of knowledge must be excellence, excellence in the investigators and excellence in the subject. The principal criterion for the support of areas of research directed toward technology advances is pertinence.

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C.

SGR Summer Schedule

The next issue of *Science & Gov* will be published August 15, 1981.

9999
Xerox-University Microfilms
300 N. Zeeb Rd
Ann Arbor MI 48106